

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – WESTERN DIVISION

PEOPLE OF CITY OF LOS ANGELES
WHO ARE UN-HOUSED, AS A
CLASS REPRESENTED BY D.
JACOBS, as representative of a class of
unhoused persons who reside and resided
in the streets and on the sidewalks of the
City of Los Angeles,

Plaintiffs.

v.

KAREN BASS, ERIC MICHAEL
GARCEtti, PAUL KREKORIAN,
ROBERT BLUMENFIELD, NITHYA
RAMAN, KATY YAROSLAVSKY,
IMELDA PADILLA, MONICA
RODRIGUEZ, MARQUEECE-
HARRIS-DAWSON, JOHN LEE,
CURREN PRICE, HEATHER HUTT,
TRACI PARK, HUGO SOTO-
MARTINEZ, KEVIN DE LEON, TIM
Mc OSKER, MONIQUE CONTRERAS,
1 "DOE" BROWN, ONE HUNDRED
UNKNOWN NAMED DEFENDANTS,
1-100,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-09320 DOC (MAAx)
*Assisigned to: Hon. Judge David O. Carter,
Ronald Reagan Cthse, Ctrm 10A; Hon. Mag.
Maria A. Audero, Roybal Bldg, Ctrm. 880*

**[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT ON
DEFENDANT MONIQUE
CONTRERAS'S MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT, OR
ALTERNATIVELY, PARTIAL
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

[Fed.R.Civ.Proc. 56]

*[Filed concurrently with Notice of Motion for
Summary Judgment; Separate Statement of
Uncontroverted Facts and Conclusion of Law;
Declarations of Monique Contreras and Eric
Melendez w-Exhibits; Request for Judicial Notice
w-Ford Decl and Exhibits; Notice of Lodging
Flashdrive]*

Date: July 14, 2025
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Crtrm.: 10A

Trial Date: May 12, 2026
Complaint Filed: October 29, 2024

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

Defendant Officer **MONIQUE CONTRERAS** brought her motion for summary judgment on July 14, 2025. After considering the motion, the separate statement of uncontested facts and conclusions of law, the declarations and evidence in support of the motion, the request for judicial notice, the opposition and reply papers, as well as the arguments of counsel, the Court finds that:

1. Defendant Monique Contreras is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on Plaintiff's Claim 19, excessive force in violation of the Fourth Amendment per 42 U.S.C. Section 1983, because the undisputed evidence shows that Officer Contreras never used any force on Plaintiff. The Court has already made a finding of fact that Officer Contreras never used force on Plaintiff.

2. Defendant Monique Contreras is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on Plaintiff's Claim 20, malicious prosecution in violation of the Fourth Amendment per 42 U.S.C. Section 1983, because the undisputed evidence shows that there was probable cause for the Penal Code § 245(c) charge, and there is no evidence to show that Officer Contreras had any involvement in the filing of criminal charges. The Court has already made a finding of fact as to the probable cause for the charge.

3. Additionally, Defendant Monique Contreras is entitled to summary judgment based on the doctrine of qualified immunity.

For all these reasons, Defendant Monique Contreras's Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED** as to all of Plaintiffs' remaining claims.

Dated:

**Honorable David O. Carter
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**